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Karlskrona Sunday, 04 June 2006
To the editors
BMC Public Health

Dear Sir,

Thank you for considering our manuscript: Validating the Johns Hopkins ACG Case-Mix System of the elderly in Swedish primary health care (ID:8598688996185326) after a second revision for evaluation of publication in BMC Public Health.

All the reviewer's valuable comments and suggestions have all been taken into consideration. How we have considered and acted on the comments is shown in detail below. We hope that you by this will find our manuscript suitable for publication in your journal.

This manuscript has neither been published nor is it currently under consideration for publication by any other journal. None of the authors have any conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this manuscript. All authors have read the final revised version of the manuscript and agree on its publication.

Yours Sincerely,

Anders Halling

Blekinge Institute for Research & Development
Erik Dahlbergsvagen 30
S-374 37, Karlishamn
Sweden
Tel: +46-455735550 Fax: +46-455735548 Email: anders.halling@ltblekinge.se

Answers to reviewer 2 (second revision): Rumana Omar

1. We agree that there is an age-dependent missingness of values which could have biased the results and the univariate model has therefore been omitted from table 3 and 4. The first model presented is now RUB and age. The whole article has been revised according to this and the reason for omitting the univariate
model has been stated in results.

2. To calculate ROC areas with CIs, predicted probabilities (linear combination) after logistic regression for each model A-E were generated into new variables. The ROC areas with CIs were then produced with ROC analysis, which are now shown in table 4. Comparison of areas under the ROC curve were subsequently performed between model A-C and model D and also individually between model A, B, C and model D, which showed that model D had significantly better discriminatory power (all analyses with p<0.001). Model D was then compared to model E (model excluding RUB) which showed that model D had a significantly better discriminatory power (p<0.001). A reference could be provided if the reviewer thinks it is necessary. Results and discussion have been revised to comment the new results.

3. English language has been corrected, if the Editor determines that it needs further language correction I will send it to an English language editor.